



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Endocrinology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRE_48091
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF ACUTE AND CHRONIC TOXICITY OF TARTRAZINE (E102) ON STERIOD REPRODUCTIVE HORMONES OF ALBINO RATS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The author is advised to transpose Tables 1 and 2 so that the different concentrations (Groups) are in the columns while the parameters are in rows. I am very familiar with GraphPad Prism and that's the right way it analyses data.</p> <p>It is also suggested to the author that similar tables could be merged. The author could merge tables 3 and 4, 5 and 6, 7 and 8, 9 and 10.</p> <p>In line 338, the author could use "supports several findings" rather than "support the findings of"</p> <p>The author is advised to provide a reference for the statements in Line 432 to 435.</p> <p>The author is advised to provide source of grants if any</p>	<p>Ok. Thank you. We decided to arrange Table 1 and 2 in this pattern because it fits into the portrait page orientation (layout). However, if we transpose Table 1 and 2 as suggested, the tables won't fit it (portrait page orientation) and we will be forced into using landscape orientation (layout) just for the tables. That was why we arranged Table 1 and 2 in this current pattern.</p> <p>Ok. Thank you so much. I have done the merging as suggested.</p> <p>Thank you. The correction has been done as suggested (now line 332).</p> <p>I think the provision of reference for the statements in Line 432 – 435 (now 427 – 430) is optional. This is because we're trying to justify the fall in testosterone concentration over the periods of 30, 60 and 90 days of treatment observed in our study.</p> <p>The source of grants for this study was provided in the original manuscript sent to the publishers. However, I think the 'source of funding' aspect was removed probably because of the publishers' policies. I don't know exactly why that section was removed from the manuscript sent for review.</p>
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	There are ethical issues in this manuscript since the research work involved the use of blood specimen from experimental animals. However, because experimental animals were used, all experimental protocols were examined and approved by the Rivers State University research/ethics committee.